MASSACHUSETTS DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION
DRINKING WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND (DWSRF)

2005 PROJECT RATING - REVIEWER'S WORKSHEET

PWS Name:		**PWS ID #:**
PWS City or Town:		**Project No.:**
Watershed:	Region:	Reviewer:

A. 1. a. The severity of the public health problem the project is intended to address.

(1) Review criteria listed below; address ALL criteria that apply and **circle** and sum applicable values.

		Scoring Value
ACUTE CONTAMINANTS		
1. Microbiological		
exceeded MCL 1-2 times		**25 or**
exceeded MCL more than 2 times		
50		
2. Nitrate level		
>5.0 but <10 mg/l		**25 or**
exceeded MCL		**50**
3. Arsenic level > 10ppb	**1-2 times**	**50 or**
	3+ times	
100		
4. Perchlorate level > 1 ppb	**1-2 times**	**50 or**
	3+ times	
100		
5. System under DEP/DWP boil order during the 18 months		**25**
6. Turbidity		
exceed MCL or action level 1-2 times		**25 or**
exceed MCL more than 2 times		**50**
CHRONIC CONTAMINANTS		
7. Inorganic		
exceed MCL or action level 1-2 times		**15 or**
exceeded MCL or action level more than 2 times		**30**
8. Radiological		
exceed MCL 1-2 times		**30 or**
exceed MCL more than 2 times		**60**
9. Organics		
exceed MCL 1-2 times		**20 or**
exceed MCL more than 2 times		**40**

10. Exceedence of any individual SDWA Rule, i.e Lead & Copper, Surface Water treatment, Disinfection by-product, etc. **20**

11. Secondary Contaminants as determined by the EPA and the DEP **10**

A.1.b. DISTRIBUTION CAPACITY/QUANTITY/RELIABILITY OF SYSTEM Scoring Dist/Quantity Value

12. Average Storage Capacity of less than 2 days **15**

13. Continual shortages as evident by a DEP emergency declaration **15**

14. Water Quantity problems not related to declared emergency **10**

15. Pressures not maintained between 20 and 80 psi **10**

16. Provide needed corrosion control **10**

17. Lead services of the Water Supplier will be replaced_____ **10**

18. Breaks per mile **1-2** **5**
More than 2 **10**

19. Replace vinyl-lined pipe **10**

20. Replace asbestos cement pipe **10**

21. Eliminate dead ends OR provide hydrants, bleed valves and/or blow-offs at dead ends **10**

22. Back-up emergency power to treatment facility **5**

23. Adequate interconnection to other Public Water system **5**

24. System affected by tuberculation and/or biofilm **25**

25. Security Measures (1 point each, to maximum of five items) **0 1 2 3 4 5**

26. Population size
100,000 and above **200**
10,000 to 99,999 **150**
3,300 to 9,999 **100**
25 to 3,299 **50**

A. 1. c. Circle the extent to which the project demonstrably eliminates the threat(s) to public health

27. Proposed project
substantially eliminates identified public health threat **200**
moderately addresses identified public health threat **100**
marginally addresses public health threat **0**

Reviewer Comments:

B. 1. a. Circle the extent to which the project is needed to ensure compliance with an existing federal or state court or administrative order.

28. Project

achieves substantial compliance with Enforcement Order	**200 or**
achieves moderate compliance with Enforcement Order	**100 or**
achieves marginal compliance with Enforcement Order	**0**

B. 1. b. The extent to which the project is needed to come into or maintain compliance with 310 CMR 22.00, the SWDA, or other required or related federal or state permit or approval, including the Department's approval of a new drinking water source.

(1) Circle and sum compliance (b) items below, to get compliance (b) value.

Scoring Compliance (b) Values:

29. Project provides DEP required disinfection of a ground water source	**23**
30. Project provides DEP required proper well construction	**23**
31. Project provides water treatment residuals manageent	**23**
32. Project provides corrosion control treatment which is required but not available or is not adequate and does not meet standards	**23**

B. 1. c. The extent to which the project is to address reasonably anticipated, additional federal or state requirements and has demonstrable benefits to or protection of drinking water quality and/or public health.

(1) Circle and sum compliance (c) items below, to get compliance (c) value.

Scoring Compliance (c) Values

33. Zero SDWA violations within the 12 months prior to application	**15**
34. Metering to >95% of customer base.	**15**
35. Upgrading or replacing	
1-2 pump stations	**5 or**
3 or more pump stations	**10**
36. Upgrading or replacing existing wells	**10**
37. Automation of treatment facility	**10**
38. Upgrade or replacement of intake structure	**10**
39. Does the system draw water from a high or medium stressed basin or low/unassessed basin with a localized flow problem noted in a WMA permit condition? (If yes, points added below)	
40. (a) Performed completed system Water Audit within past 2 years?	**3**
If yes and in stressed basin as noted above (#39)	**3**

(b) Performed leak detection survey of 100% of the distribution system over the last 2 years **3**

If answer is yes and is in stressed basin as noted in #39 above **3**

(c) Has fixed the following percentage of leaks (3 gpm or larger) detected in survey:

100% **4 (8 if also in stressed basin see #39)**

50% or more **2 (4 if also in stressed basin see #39)**

41. (a) Residential per capita water use

In low stress/unassessed basins that use 80 gpcd or less **2**

In low stress/unassessed basins that use 65 gpcd or less **4**

In stressed basins or portions of basins (as defined by question 39 above) that use 65 gpcd or less **8**

(b) Unaccounted for water

For low stress/unassessed basins and rate is 15% or less **10**

For high/medium stress basins and rate is 10% or less 10

(c) For the last 2 years, were all venturi metering systems calibrated twice per year and are all inline meters calibrated annually? **2**

42. DEP-approved Source Water Protection Plan **10**

43. Water supplier has taken significant local action to promote conservation such as increasing block rate **15**

44. Project achieves compliance in anticipation of a requirement. **15**

Reviewer Comments:

C. Affordability Criteria [See 310 CMR 45.06(c).] *10% of the weight will be on affordability criteria.*

(1) Circle and sum affordability items below, to get affordability value.

Scoring Affordability Values

C. 1. (a.) Systems with service area median income of $40,401or less. (That is, 80% or less of State Median Household Income of $50,502.)

(1) To answer this question, applicants may use the MHI prepared by the US Census from 1999. **http://quickfacts.census.gov** , for the most appropriate city, town, or census designated place completely including the service area of the applicant. If that service area includes more than one such designated MHI area, a weighted overall average based on population served in each of the covered MHI areas times the MHI for that area plus the same for any other such area, and divided by the total number served, shall be used to calculate the combined MHI.

(2) Alternatively, applicants may provide a service-area-specific MHI from an independent income survey covering the service area, provided that said independent survey is no more than eleven years old at the time of application.

45. All systems in such communities: 100

C. 1. (b.) Systems which will have rates to end users which result from the project in excess of 1% of the median household income MHI of the service area will be awarded points as shown below:

46. Range:

Greater than 1.75%	**100 or**
1.5% to 1.749%	**70 or**
1.25% to 1.499%	**50 or**
1.0% to 1.1.249%	**20**

Documentation provided Y/N _____

D. 1. Whether the project is to consolidate and/or restructure a public water system to accomplish System Expansion (Takeover/Consolidation) to Eliminate a Public Health Problem or a Capacity Development Problem *[Need to ensure that the water quality in systems being taken over is maintained or improved.]*

(1) Circle and sum consolidation/restructuring values.

Scoring Consolidation/Restructuring Values

47. Consolidation/Restructuring	
to take over 1-2 systems	**40 or**
to take over 2 or more systems	**80**
48. Consolidation/Restructuring to replace a source instead of treating contamination in the system to be taken over (or threat of contamination as determined by a DEP approved study that indicates a plume of contamination moving toward source)	**80**

D. 2. The extent to which the project implements or is consistent with one or more current watershed management plans (e.g., EOEA basin plans) and/or watershed protection plans

(1) Sum watershed management values below, to get total watershed management value.

Scoring Watershed Management Values

49. Project implements a	
EOEA Watershed Plan recommendation	**80 or**
System Master plan recommendation	**40 or**
Local capital planning recommendation	**20 or**
DEP Regional priority	**10**

D. 3. Circle whether the project constitutes or is a component of a multi-community or regional approach

50. Multi-community project that	
substantially addresses regional or basin problem	**80 or**
moderately addresses regional or basin problem	**40 or**
[No relevant response]	**0**
51. Approved Commonwealth Capital Application Score	
approved by Commonwealth Development or to be determined (TBD)	**_____**

Reviewer Comments:

Total Proposal Score _____
(Sum of criteria scores from above)